



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,919	03/05/2002	David M. Choy	SVL920010092US1	7085

23373 7590 08/08/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,919

Applicant(s)

CHOY ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S. Lu

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-26 and 28-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-26 and 28-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/24/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

1. The Action is responsive to the Applicant's Amendments, filed on May 27, 2005.
2. The Applicant's amendments made to claims 1, 7, 14, 20, 26 and 33 are considered and addressed in the Office Action for non-Final Rejection (hereafter "the Action", as described below. Noted is the Applicant's canceling of claims 8 and 27 in the amendments.
3. As for the Applicant's Arguments with respect to claims 1-43 rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7, 9-26 and 28-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Parnell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,647,396, hereafter "Parnell").

As per claims 1, 14, 20 and 33, Parnell teaches the following:

"associating a root component of the content management object with a row in a first relational database table" (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 36-45 wherein Parnell's content

management object ECMREVISION is the root component of the content management system whose table of the same name associates with attributes is equivalent to Applicant's associating a root component of an object to a row of relational database table);

"associating attributes of the root component with corresponding columns of the first relational database table" (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 36-45 wherein Parnell's content management object ECMREVISION is the root component of the content management system whose table of the same name associates with attributes document, data, author, comment, edition and effectivity date is equivalent to Applicant's associating attributes of the root component with corresponding columns of the first relational database table);

"associating additional components of the content management object, if any, to rows in additional relational database tables" (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell's tables ECMVERSION DATA and ECM DOCUMENT are each associated with an attribute of the root component is equivalent to Applicant's associating additional table rows to additional objects); and

"using the item defined by the relational database tables to construct a plurality of high level content management data models, each corresponding to a different application" (See col. 6, lines 45-67 wherein Parnell's classification based content is utilized for different content management object operation models where each model is associated with different operation equivalent to Applicant's using the item defined by the relational

database tables to construct a plurality of high level content management data models, each corresponding to a different application).

As per claims 2, 15, 21 and 34, Parnell teaches “each of the additional components comprises a child component of a root component or a child component of another component” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s components ECMCLASSIFICATION, ECM DOCUMENT and ECMREVISION are associated in child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant’s child-parent component relationship).

As per claims 3, 16, 22 and 35, Parnell teaches “using a foreign key in a child component to reference its parent component” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s child component ECMCLASSIFICATION points to its parent component ECM DOCUMENT by using classification as a key is equivalent to Applicant’s using a foreign key in a child component to reference its parent component).

As per claims 4, 17, 23 and 36, Parnell teaches “an attribute comprises a pointer to a data source stored in a separate repository” (See Figs. 1, 6 and col. 7, lines 13-37 wherein Parnell’s attribute 9140Specs points to Server Discs and 9140 Disc is equivalent to Applicant’s separate repository and pointers of data source).

As per claims 5, 18 and 24, Parnell teaches “an attribute comprises a pointer to another content management object” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s content management objects ECMCLASSIFICATION, ECM DOCUMENT and ECMREVISION are associated with and pointed to each other in a child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant’s attributes pointers and content management objects).

As per claims 6, 19 and 25, Parnell teaches “a row in an table comprises a link between a source item and a target item” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s table ECM DOCUMENT is linked to parent and child tables ECMREVISION and ECMCLASSIFICATION, respectively in a child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant’s pointer pointing from one row of data to one row of another table).

As per claim 37, Parnell teaches the following:
“present a query to a user as to a content item” (See Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 28-39 wherein Parnell’s querying database for requested tag to reference and execute against metadata for content is equivalent to Applicant’s query to a user as to a content item);
“based upon the end user’s response, present a subsequent query as to the content item” (See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 18-27 wherein Parnell’s SQL queries are generated to access content management database is equivalent to Applicant’s query presentation to the content item); and

“based upon the end user’s further responses, determine the sub-components and attributes of the item” (See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 28-43 wherein Parnell’s browser metaphor is utilized to access and manipulate the contents of a content management system is equivalent to Applicant’s based upon the end user’s further responses, determine the sub-components and attributes of the item).

As per claims 7 and 26, Parnell teaches the following:

“entering multimedia content data metadata and schema in the low level physical model” (See Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 15-23 wherein Parnell’s database portion is the low level physical model for content data and schema is equivalent to Applicant’s entering multimedia content data metadata and schema in low level physical model);

“mapping the metadata and schema to the data engine” (See col. 6, lines 15-42 wherein Parnell’s data for describing the structures of the tables and organizations of the database is the metadata and schema mapping of content data to the data engine is equivalent to Applicant’s mapping of metadata and schema to data engine); and

“the low level physical model supports a plurality of high level content models” (See Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 15-23 wherein Parnell’s database portion is the low level physical model to support high level content model of application and application programming interface is equivalent to Applicant’s low level model supports a plurality of high level content models).

As per claims 9 and 28, Parnell teaches “wherein the high level content model comprises an application program interface embodying a representation of one or more data structures and constraints” (See Figs. 1, 3, col. 3, lines 15-23 and col. 4, lines 18-43 wherein Parnell’s high level content model comprises of application and application programming interface for interfacing the tables of the content management database is equivalent Applicant’s high level model comprising application interface).

As per claims 10 and 29, Parnell teaches “the high level content model supports a plurality of content application requirements” (See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 7-12 wherein Parnell’s high level content model supports various modules, such as backbone, classification engine, version management and maintenance API is equivalent Applicant’s high level content model supports application requirements).

As per claims 11 and 30, Parnell teaches “the low level physical model is extensible” (See col. 5, lines 7-10 wherein Parnell’s documents represent items are versioned suggests Applicant’s low level physical model is extensible).

As per claims 12 and 31, Parnell teaches “adding additional high level content models” (See col. 3, lines 48-67 wherein Parnell’s replication module provides a variety of functions, including subscribing file from one provider and storing all the content classified into a specific local directory is equivalent to Applicant’s adding additional high level content models).

As per claims 13 and 32, Parnell teaches “the data engine is chosen from the group consisting of relational database management systems, object oriented database management systems, object-relational database management systems and XML data repositories” (See col.1 line 59 – col. 2, line 34 and col. 6, lines 17-42 wherein Parnell’s database portion is a relational database management system is equivalent to Applicant’s relational database management, object oriented database management, object-relational database management systems and XML data repositories). . .

As per claim 38, Jensen teaches the following:

“present a query to a user as to a content item” (See Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 28-39 wherein Parnell’s querying database for requested tag to reference and execute against metadata for content is equivalent to Applicant’s query to a user as to a content item);

“based upon the end user’s response, present a subsequent query as to the content item” (See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 18-27 wherein Parnell’s SQL queries are generated to access content management database is equivalent to Applicant’s query presentation to the content item);

“based upon the end user’s further responses, determine the sub-components and attributes of the item” (See Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 28-43 wherein Parnell’s browser metaphor is utilized to access and manipulate the contents of a content management system is equivalent to Applicant’s based upon the end user’s further responses, determine the sub-components and attributes of the item);

“associating each component of the content item with a row in a separate relational database table” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s tables ECMVERSION DATA and ECM DOCUMENT are each associated with an attribute of the root component is equivalent to Applicant’s associating each component of the content item with a row in a separate relational database table); and

“associating attributes of the content item with corresponding columns of the relational database tables” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 36-45 wherein Parnell’s content management object ECMREVISION the component of the content management system whose table of the same name associates with attributes document, data, author, comment, edition and effectivity date is equivalent to Applicant’s associating attributes of the content item with corresponding columns of the relational database tables).

As per claim 39, Jensen teaches “foreign key in a child component to reference its parent component” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s child component ECMCLASSIFICATION points to its parent component ECM DOCUMENT by using classification as a key is is equivalent to Applicant’s foreign keys).

As per claim 40, Jensen teaches “a sub-component comprises a child component of a root component or a child component of another child component” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell’s components ECMCLASSIFICATION, ECM DOCUMENT and ECMREVISION are associated in child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant’s child-parent component relationship).

As per claim 41, Jensen teaches “an attribute comprises a pointer to a data repository where the component is stored” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell's content management objects ECMCLASSIFICATION, ECM DOCUMENT and ECMREVISION are associated with and pointed to each other in a child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant's repository and pointers of data source).

As per claim 42, Jensen teaches “an attribute comprises a pointer to a data resource stored in a separate repository” (See Figs. 1, 6 and col. 7, lines 13-37 wherein Parnell's attribute 9140Specs points to Server Discs and 9140 Disc is equivalent to Applicant's separate repository and pointers of data source).

As per claim 43, Jensen teaches “a row in an table comprises a link between a source item and a target item” (See Fig. 4 and col. 5, lines 1-10 wherein Parnell's table ECM DOCUMENT is linked to parent and child tables ECMREVISION and ECMCLASSIFICATION, respectively in a child-parent relationship is equivalent to Applicant's pointer pointing from one row of data to one row of another table).

Conclusions

6. The prior art made of record

G. U.S. Patent No. 6,647,396

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. U.S. Patent No. 6,078,926

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331

C. U.S. Patent No. 5,913,205

D. U.S. Publication 2001/0052032

E. U.S. Patent No. 5,907,846

F. U.S. Patent No. 6,405,205

Contact information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 am-5:30 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuen S. Lu


Patent Examiner

August 3, 2005


Mohammad Ali

Primary Examiner

August 3, 2005